



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

TRANSACTIONS
OF THE
AMERICAN PHILOLOGICAL ASSOCIATION.
1879.

I.—*Modal Development of the Shemitic Verb.*

BY CRAWFORD H. TOY,
NEW YORK CITY.

The verb-structure in the Shemitic family of languages is one of the simplest in the world—simpler than that of many uninflecting tongues. This is true, whatever may have been the history of the family before it became what we now call Shemitic. Through what changes it has past we do not know, but in its present form it is marked by poverty of verbal expression; or, we may say, it has, by a process of sifting, reduced its verbal apparatus almost to a minimum. We may consider it as reasonably certain that the verb in this class of languages was originally a noun or (what amounts to the same thing) that it began its development at a time when there was no distinction of form between noun and verb.* This noun or noun-verb advanced in two directions: first, by the addition of syllables (prefixes, probably originally independent words) that attach substantiv-ideas to the signification of the root, producing derived stems, which are in a sort new verbs; secondly, by the purely inflectional modification of the noun-stem by additions at the beginning

*See my article on “the nominal basis of the Hebrew verb” in vol. VIII. of the *Transactions* (1877).

and end, and the differentiation of these different forms into various modal expressions of the action.

By modal modification in the broadest sense is meant any modification that does not add a substantiv idea to that of the verb-root, but only expresses an accident of the action. It may include all expressions of the time and completeness of actions and the conception of them as real or unreal. The material that the primitiv Shemitic selected for this expression consists of two noun-stems, one simpl trilateral and another provided with a prefix. Whatever the original force of these two forms may have been, they were in the earliest time of which we have information devoted to the representation of the ideas of completeness and incompleteness respectively. The attempt to establish a separate form for the expression of temporal accidents in actions was, for some unknown reason, abandoned, and such temporal expression came in only as a secondary application of what may be called the completional force of the two forms.* The second of these, the incomplete, or better, the inchoativ, ingressiv, received farther inflectional modification by terminations which in the noun express case-relations, or a strengthend, intensified condition of the object. The subject-relation or Nominativ was represented by the ending *u* (to take the form in which we actually find it), the object-relation or Accusativ by *a*, the possessiv-relation or Genitiv by *i*, while in each of these the state of independence and intensity was indicated by the addition of an *m* or *n*, and the state of dependence not only by the omission of this letter, but sometimes also by the dropping of the vowel-endings. We should thus have seven possibl forms of the Inchoativ, but in fact the language has chosen to use commonly only four, namely, the two in *u* and *i*, the vowelless form and the strengthend form in *a* (*am* or *an* and *anna*)†. The modal material thus comprises five forms, the complete,

*The Assyrian offers no real exception, for it is generally agreed that if it had a true present tense it has borrowed it from the Accadian, or made it under Accadian influence, so that the tense cannot be regarded as properly Shemitic.

† *Um*, *umma*, *imma* also in Assyrian (Oppert, Assyrian Grammar, p. 50); and there are traces of an *i*-form in Arabic.

katala, and the *Inchoativ*, *yaktulu*, *yaktula*, *yaktul*, *yaktulan* (and its variation *yaktulanna*). As has been said, we do not know how the completional distinction came to reside in these two forms; but, once there, it would easily lend itself to the expression of temporal distinctions (as it did in some cases, particularly in later stages of the language, the idea of past time attaching itself to the Complete or Perfect, and that of future time to the Inchoativ); and so also it came to set forth those distinctions that are usually specially characterized by the name "modal," those that deal with the subjectively real and unreal. We may designate the five forms as follows: 1. the Complete or Perfect (describing an action simply as finisht); 2. the Inchoativ in *u*, or the *u*-form (describing an independent inchoativ or ingressiv action); 3. the Inchoativ in *a*, or the *a*-form (in which the ingressiv act is conceivd of as dependent); 4. the vowelless or Jezma-form (representing the action as sharply detach); 5. the Inchoativ in *an* (or *anna*), or the *an*-form (the strengthend, intensiv presentation). But in the four last the essential inchoate ingressiv signification remains always prominent, and the shades of difference between them may sometimes become almost invisibl. Let us look at the actual uses of the forms in the various Shemitic dialects, taking first the expression of the several modal conceptions and then the functions of the several forms. The Imperativ may be reckond (as it is allied in signification to the Perfect on the one hand and to the Jezma-form and the *an*-form on the other) as a halfway-form between the Perfect and the Inchoativ.

We begin with the expression of modal ideas, and first *command*. 1. This is renderd in all the dialects by the Imperativ in both its forms, the simpl, and the strengthend or emphatic in *an*. But the Imperativ is employd in positiv command only, not in prohibition—a fact the discussion of which we shal come to below. It is also confined to the second person. 2. The Jezma-form is employd extensivly to express command. Thus in Arabic it occurs frequently with the prefix *li*, which indicates a nominal conception of the verb; *li-yaktul* is "for his kiling," "let him kil." The

conception of command, as involving something as yet non-existent, usually attaches itself to the Inchoativ, and, as carrying with it decision, naturally also to the shortest, sharpest form. This Jezma-form is generally used in the third person, but sometimes in the others; the greater brevity of the Imperativ suits the greater sharpness of the direct address to a person. The construction with *li* occurs apparently also in Jewish Aramaic in a jussiv or optativ sense, and Ethiopic has a similar form with *la*. Without the prefixt particle this form (which, however, everywhere except in Arabic represents not merely the original vowelless Inchoativ, but the others as well) is used for positiv command in all the dialects, usually in the third person, and, with a negativ particle, for prohibition. The Hebrew distinguishes between negativ command and negativ exhortation—the former is introduced by *lo*, the latter by *al*. 3. The long Inchoativ in *an* and *anna* (principally in Arabic). With the negativ *la* it expresses prohibition, differing from the short form only in being emphatic.

The similarity in meaning between these three forms is obvious, but the dissimilarity in form is no less obvious. The short Inchoativ has dropt the original final vowel, while the long form is the strengthened Accusativ, and the Imperativ has the simple stem without the preformativ *ya* characteristic of the Inchoativ. It has been suggested by some grammarians that the Imperativ is derived from the Jezma-form by dropping the preformativ, but this explanation is clumsy, and therefore improbabl. It is simpler to go back to the original form and meaning of the stem of the noun-verb. The Imperativ is the simpl noun inflected in gender and number, and, because used on account of its vigorous brevity in direct address, confined to the second person; it is the bare noun or name of a thing spoken sharply and decisivly. Perhaps the activity involved in the expression excluded the passiv sense; or the absence of Passiv Imperativs in Shemitic may be nothing more than a formal accident, the result of the choice of another construction to avoid ambiguity of form. Some such fact also may serve to account for the avoidance of the negativ

Imperativ, possibly coupled with the feeling that in such cases there was less sharpness in the expression. However this may be, there is no need to suppose the Imperativ a derivativ from the short Inchoativ. Stil less reason is there for regarding this latter as derived from the Imperativ. It is based on the form out of which the latter was developed ; but the two took their several ways, reaching the same point by different lines, but always retaining their distinctiv characteristics. The Jezma-form remains an Inchoativ, and out of the inchoativ signification develops its jussiv force (we shal see that this is not its only force) in the way above indicated. The *an*-form with a like inchoativ signification comes naturally to the same use, only with its added emphasis (as also in the Imperativ there is a similar emphatic long form in *an*) ; whatever peculiarity of meaning may exist in the *a*-form which is its base, does not appear in this use. We are thus forced to go back to the original significance of these forms, and to allow them large latitude within the bounds of the essential meaning.

Let us next take the expressions of *wish*. 1. Here we find the Perfect widely used. In Arabic and Ethiopic it is employed in the largest sense, of any wish, and quite answers to the use of the Greek Optativ. In this construction of the Perfect there is no distinct formal expression of wish ; it merely represents the act as a completed thing (in the intensity of desire that it shal be) and leaves the precise meaning to be suggested by the tone or context. In Hebrew, however, the Perfect expresses only a wish that is known to be unfulfild—the action stated to be complete is contrasted by the context with the present reality, and thus recognizd as non-existent. In another Canaanite dialect, the Phenician, the usage agrees with that of the Arabic. 2. Arabic employs the long Inchoativ in *an*, the emphatic force of which is appropriate to the expression of wish, in which there is usually more or less of intensity. It is obvious also that the desired thing, as in the nature of the case not yet existent, is properly represented by the inchoativ form of the verb, which exhibits the action as one just entered on and incomplete ; the

incomplete stands close to the non-existent. 3. In Ethiopic, Hebrew, and Aramaic we have the Inchoativ, which in these dialects is at present a vowelless form (except with suffixes), but is a representative of all the forms of the Inchoativ, except the *an*-form, and therefore does not specially correspond to the Arabic Jezma-form. Hebrew, however, pursuing its course of abbreviation, has an apocopate form still shorter than this last, and employs it in the expression of wish. In both the Hebrew forms the inchoate sense is the prominent one; and the brevity of the shorter form is appropriate to the energy and excitement of the state of mind involved. 4. The Assyrian has a special form made by prefixing *lu* or *li* to the Inchoativ. Whether this is imitated after the Accadian (which makes a Precativ by prefix *ga*) is uncertain; such a precativ form is found in Jewish Aramaic, and is not unlike the Arabic Jezma-form with prefix *li* and the Ethiopic with prefix *la*. In any case, however, the modal force is in the verb-stem, and the same remarks apply here as above.

These differences of construction exhibit considerable flexibility in the Shemitic conception of wish, yet are easily explained by reference to the original force of the verb-forms. We can also understand how the Arabic, desiring to bring out the element of energy and intensity, does not employ the *u*-form of the Inchoativ, nor the Jezma-form (having besides appropriated these to other uses), but confines itself to Perfect and long Inchoativ in *an*.

The *voluntativ* form, that used to express determination of will, resolution, is of course the *an*-form of the Inchoativ. This use is fully developed only in Arabic; it is, however, not infrequent in Hebrew (in the first person), and is found in Assyrian. The relation between form and meaning is obvious; the Inchoativ suits the non-existent character of the verb-act, and the energetic *an* is appropriate to the natural energy of the thought. Here again we fail to see any trace of the dependent force of the *a*-form on which this longer form seems to be built; there is, however, a discernible relation between the voluntativ and the objectiv sense of the *a*-form, the latter expressing the object towards which the

determination is directed. In Hebrew the voluntativ ends in *a*, and is probably the representativ of the old *an*-form, the Hebrew throwing away the nunation or mimation, as it does habitually in singular nouns. It would indeed be possible to regard this Hebrew voluntativ as the original *a*-form, which had not been confined to the dependent sense that we meet in its use in Arabic; but the analogies obtained by a comparison between the Hebrew and the other Shemitic dialects rather point to the former explanation—the Hebrew verb everywhere shows signs of phonetic decadence.

Purpose is naturally express by the Inchoativ, since it looks to an unaccomplisht object. As telic constructions are necessarily syntactically dependent, the Arabic employs for these its *a*-form, the Subjunctive, which especially indicates the object aimed at. It has, however, somewhat petrified the construction, always introducing the verb by *li* or some other particl meaning “in order that.” The Arabian grammarians also insist that there is always an elision of *an* “that” after *li*; but this is a mere grammatical fancy, the real power of the modal expression being in the verb, or rather in the combination of the real preposition *li* and the verb: the expression “he went *li yaktula* that he might kil” means “he went to kiling.” In Ethiopic also the shorter form of the verb (commonly called Subjunctiv) is employd in this construction, either alone or after the particles *kama* and *za* “in order that.” This Ethiopic verb-form, tho now without final vowel, represents formally all the original unemphatic Inchoativs, but performs a part similar to that of the Arabic *a*-form. Hebrew, Aramaic and Assyrian use their own Inchoativ, which also represents the original three; and there is no means of determining whether the peculiar Arabic force of the *a*-form ever existed in these languages; whether, that is, it was a part of the original Shemitic material, or is a special development of Arabic. In Hebrew, tho the introductory conjunction is common in this construction, it is sometimes omitted, the telic form being suggested by the juxtaposition of the words, and the same omission is found in Arabic with the *u*-form; the objectiv nature of the dependent verb, which is elsewhere

represented in Arabic by the termination *a*, is here given by the inchoativ sense and by the position. The ordinary Arabic use of *li* and the Inchoativ is parallel with the common Shemitic telic construction of preposition and Infinitiv, and the comparison between the two brings out the nominal character of the Inchoativ.

The expression of general *result* or *limit* is nearly the same as that of purpose. Arabic employs the *a*-form and Ethiopic its shorter and longer forms, with the appropriate conjunctions. The relation of dependence is as obvious here as in the telic constructions, but the Ethiopic is freer in the use of the verb-forms, and shows that the process of petrification had not advanced very far. This long form in Ethiopic (which has a vowel under the first radical of the stem), tho a true Shemitic Inchoativ in its function, is of doubtful origin; whether its inserted vowel is of nativ production, or is an imitation after a non-Shemitic language, is not clear. But in any case its syntactical force is beyond doubt, and there is no ground in the usage of the Ethiopic for supposing that this long form carried with it any non-Shemitic idea, or played any other part than that of the Inchoativ. The Arabic further employed the *u*-form in the ecbatic construction, when the conjunction was omitted, whence we must infer, not that it confounded purpose and result, but that a certain liberty in the use of the verb-forms existed. The form set apart as the expression of the object (the *a*-form) was employed after the preposition, but in the absence of the preposition the relations of incompleteness and dependence, given respectively by the form and the position, were considered to be sufficiently expressed in the *u*-form. Such uses point to a time when the present stiff differentiation of verb-use in Arabic grammar did not exist.* When, however, it is desired to represent the result as an accomplished fact, the Arabic uses the Perfect. In Hebrew, result is usually expressed by the construction of sequence, and the verb follows the ordinary Hebrew laws of sequence.

*A similar phenomenon exists in the Latin use of *quum* with the Subjunctiv.

In the construction of *object-sentences* (in which one clause is the object of the action contained in the preceding) the form of the verb in the dependent clause is determined strictly by the nature of the thought. 1. Where the action in the dependent clause is conceived as really existent in past or present, the Perfect is used in all the dialects, as after verbs of saying, seeing, thinking and the like. If the action lies in the present and is to be represented as continuous, Arabic permits the use of the *u*-form. 2. In the case of future action, after verbs of thinking, supposing, etc., the *u*-form and the *a*-form are found in Arabic; these set forth the action as non-existent, with the difference that the *a*-form expresses a close dependence. The Ethiopic employs its long form (called in the grammars the Imperfect) in some similar cases, as after verbs of beginning and ceasing. The Hebrew prefers the Infinitiv-construction, which is also found in the other dialects. 3. Where the act of the dependent clause is in the highest degree unreal, as after verbs of wishing, expecting, etc., we find the *a*-form in Arabic (introduced by the conjunction *an* "that"), and in such cases the Ethiopic has its shorter form (Subjunctiv) with or without a conjunction.

Conditional and other correlativ sentences show a great variety of constructions, yet always under the control of the proper force of the various verb-forms. I. The simplest case is where the condition or the act of the antecedent clause is represented as really existent, and the apodosis or consequent act also real; the rule in this case is that the Perfect shall be used in both clauses. Where there are seeming exceptions, they are the result of some peculiar conception of the action in the mind of the writer. Instead of the Perfect the participi is sometimes employed, especially in Aramaic, when it is desired to express a present or continuous act. II. The usage is the same when the condition is determined as unreal. The act is represented as complete, and the context indicates its true character. III. When the condition or antecedent action is put merely as a supposed existing fact, or as in general undetermined and ideal, the form of the verbs in the two classes depends on the special coloring that it is intended to

giv the action. 1. It is not uncommon to find the Perfect in both clauses in Arabic and Ethiopic, by which the condition and the result, tho from the context obviously future, are put as finisht or as actually present. This construction is not found except where the condition is patent and near at hand, or where for the sake of energy and vivacity the speaker or writer desires so to represent it. 2. In those dialects that hav reduced their Inchoativs to a single form, Hebrew, Aramaic, Ethiopic, the use of this form is the prevailing one. Hebrew uses its Imperfect in protasis and apodosis; but, in accordance with its laws of sequence, often expresses the apodosis by Waw with the Perfect. In this case the Perfect does not abandon its proper signification; tho Hebrew in its law of sequence has petrified its constructions, it is always possibl to recognize the original meanings of the verb-forms, and in this case the Perfect acts as the same form in Arabic describd above. In Aramaic the participl often takes the place of the Imperfect in the apodosis, with a force not very different from that of the Perfect. The Ethiopic moves more freely, and varies its verb-forms according to the demands of the thought, especially in the apodosis. In the protasis the verb is usually Perfect—the language has chosen as a rule to look on a condition as something already settled, as a mere assumd preliminary to the result, and then the time of the result fixes the form of the verb of the apodosis: if the time is future, the verb is Imperfect; if past, the verb is Perfect. But, if the time of the protasis be present, the verb is commonly Imperfect, in order to express the incomplete character of the action. 3. The above examples of the use of Perfect and Inchoativ respectivly to set forth conditions and results conceivd of as real and unreal or ideal are easily intelligibl from the nature of the verb-forms. In Arabic we find further a differentiation in the use of the Inchoativ not possibl to the other dialects, and especially a peculiar use of the Jezma-form (the Jussiv of the grammars). This form is subject to various special rules of use, being, like the α -form (Subjunctiv) brought into stif connection with certain particles; but its employment in conditional sentences obliges us

to recur to its essential inchoativ signification, and to lay aside that special jussiv force that has given it its ordinary name. In sentences in which condition and result are represented as merely supposed facts we find this Jezma-form sometimes in both clauses, sometimes in only one, the Perfect commonly standing in the other. Further the *u*-form and the *an*-form are found in place of the Jezma-form. If this makes it necessary to regard this last as in these cases performing the part of a simpl Inchoativ (an expression of incomplete, ingressiv action), it does not prevent us from recognizing something special in its character and force. Its distinction from the Perfect, with which it is often brought into contact in these conditional constructions, is clear enuf: the Perfect represents the act as really complete and present, the Jezma-form puts it as something just entered on or to be entered on. We can also understand how it differs from the *an*-form, which is always emphatic, and always so emphasizes the incomplete nature of the action as to locate it in the future distinctly. The *a*-form has its special function of dependence in Arabic, tho it sometimes leaves this in the background and brings forward its original inchoativ force. But how does the Jezma-form differ from the long Inchoativ in *u*, with which it sometimes alternates in these constructions? Certainly not by any element of command supposed to reside in it, for if this explanation would serve in constructions where an Imperativ stands in the antecedent clause, or for the apodosis in general, it would be wholly insufficient for the protasis, in which a command would be out of place. Nor can it be said of the Jezma-form that it interchanges in sense with the Perfect. It is tru that after the negativ particles *lam* and *lamma* it has what seems to us a present or proper perfect signification, but the explanation no doubt is that the language came to regard the action after these partcl's as an incipient one, a thing that from the nature of the thought could not be existent, and yet was thought of as about to be, on the point of beginning. It is this feeling that controls the verb-use, and has made the Jezma-form the rule. This projection of the feeling of a speaker, or of that mas of

speaking that constitutes a language, into the circumstances of an action is not uncommon, and the particular feeling may often appear strange to one accustomed to the modes of thought of a different language. We are so far removed from Shemitic methods of conception that it may well be hard for us to comprehend and explain their grammatical constructions, especially when they take a petrified shape, that is, a shape that is doubtless the product of a natural feeling, but the isolation of which and the absence of free movement in the language disguises its force and conceals its origin. It is so to a great extent, for example, with the Hebrew usage of sequence, in which the verb-forms seem to us to shift in an arbitrary and surprising way, and in which, though we may be able to discern its general signification, there remains after our best efforts a certain unknown something. It would not be strange, then, if we should find it not easy to explain all the uses of the Arabic Jezma-form, which the language has evidently dealt with in a somewhat peculiar way. We cannot explain historically how its construction with *lam* arose any more than how the Hebrew use of verbs after Waw arose, and we cannot determine the precise feeling of the conditional use of the Jezma-form. But we know enough of its application to enable us to give a general statement of its signification. When we observe its use as a jussive, its employment after certain negatives in what seems to us to be very nearly a categorical sense, and its function in some conditional sentences, we are led to the conclusion that it is the extremest expression in Arabic of the purely inchoative sense—it is the most delicate presentation of that peculiarly Shemitic conception of an action as being just on the point of beginning, so that to us it seems to hover over the dividing line between the existent and the non-existent. Its curtailed form may be connected with this peculiar significance, either by virtue simply of the resulting brevity, or by the comparative isolation that the absence of the vowel suggests. Whatever may be the relation between form and meaning, this view of its signification offers something like an explanation of its uses. The explanation of the construction with the negatives *lam* and

lamma is suggested above. Its jussiv force may easily come from its exhibition of an act as being on the point of happening, as in English the future tense is sometimes used where a command is involvd. The conditional use follows in the same way: in the protasis the Jezma-form gives the act as incipient, and this suggests its immediate occurrence and also its present non-existence—it thus represents the condition as a supposd fact, lying near to the speaker and calling forth an immediate interest. Its range in actual use is wide—it occurs in constructions that in Greek would include Indicativ, Subjunctiv, and Optativ; but it always maintains its own force, and must be interpreted not according to our usages, but according to the modes of conception of the Shemitic people. The longer Inchoativ form in *u* does not emphasize the idea of incipency so sharply and delicately as the Jezma-form, and is rarely used in conditionals. It occurs in the apodosis when that is separated from the protasis by the connectiv particip *fa* “then.” In this case the separation effected by the partiel confers a certain independence on the second clause, and it adopts the more general expression of the inchoativ sense. Stil more rarely does the *a*-form occur, only where a second parallel verb follows the Jezma-form in protasis or apodosis, and that under certain conditions in the use of partiels. It appears therefore that the Arabic treats the constructions with the negativ particles *lam*, *lamma*, and the conditional particles *in* and others, alike, regarding the action in all of them as a thing imminent, not existent, but on the point of beginning. It is not, indeed, confin’d to this view—the Perfect, as we hav seen, is sometimes employd to vary the conception by representing the action by anticipation as really existent, and other shades of meaning are given by the employment of the forms in *u* and *a*. This last construction is rare; practically the ideal conditional forms in Arabic are the Perfect and the Jezma-form, the forms in *u* and *a* being devoted to other uses, and the selection is based on the significations of the verb-forms and the conception of the conditional above describd.

We may sum up this rapid view of the modal constructions

in Shemitic by a statement of the modal functions of the several verb-forms. 1. The Perfect is primarily the expression of an existent complete act, in present, past, or future time, and thus covers the ground occupied in the Indo-European languages by the Indicativ Perfect, Aorist, Pluperfect, and Future-perfect. But it also performs the part of an Optativ, the object wisht for being represented by anticipation as actually in complete existence. In Hebrew it is used in those optativ sentences only in which the thing desired is located in the past, and known to be impossibl. Further it is generally employd in Shemitic in conditional sentences in which condition and result are known and declared to be either real or unreal, and also frequently where the condition or the result or both are put simply as ideal or supposed cases. It is a favorit conditional form in Arabic and Ethiopic. 2. The Inchoativ in *u* is commonly employd in what we call the Indicativ sense, and stands contrasted with the Perfect by representing the action as ingressiv or incipient in present past, and future, answering to our Present, Imperfect, and Future. But as the Shemitic and Indo-European conceptions of the verb are very different, the former distinguishing only the completional and not the temporal element of the act, these two Shemitic forms are in fact used each over the whole ground of the Indo-European verb, the Perfect often standing where we should use Present or simple Future, and the Imperfect or Inchoativ in the place of our Aorist or Future-perfect. Tho commonly occurring in this Indicativ sense in Arabic (and it is not found as a grammatically distinct form in the other dialects), it is used also, as we have seen, in telic and conditional sentences to express relations of dependence and subjectiv unreality. As to the name Indicativ, it belongs not only to this form, but sometimes to the Perfect and to the Jezma-form and *an*-form also. 3. The Inchoativ in *a*, modally distinguisht only in Arabic, is devoted to the expression of relations of dependence, such as ideal result, purpose, limit, and sequence. This use flows from its inchoativ sense, and from the objectiv force proper to it as the objectiv case of the noun-verb. It looks forward to a point as

yet non-existent; when the object of the action is to be represented as already attained, one of the properly Indicativ forms is used, either the Perfect or the *u*-form, according to the speaker's conception of the complete or continuous character of the action. There is no reason in the form itself why it should be so rarely employed in conditional constructions (as is stated above); usage alone has determined its restriction to its particular class of constructions; only an occasional deviation enables us to recognize the broader signification that underlies its present special use. 4. The vowelless or Jezma-form is appropriated to the expression of command (chiefly in the first and third persons) and to conditional and certain negative sentences, its form and meaning permitting, indeed, a wider use, but suiting very well the comparatively restricted range that usage assigns it. Its jussive sense passes naturally in some cases (particularly in negative sentences) into an optative. 5. The longest Inchoative form in *an* or *anna* follows the Jezma-form so closely in signification that we should naturally think of it as a derivative from the latter, but for its vowel *a*, which rather connects it with the *a*-form. It is, however, a true Indicative in the first instance, and often acts as an emphatic extension of the form in *u*, tho always as a Future. Its uses in prohibition, wish, and in conditional sentences are to be explained, as above, by its inchoative sense, to which is always added the emphasis proper to its form. It is an emphatic Imperative and Optative. In Hebrew it occurs in a fragmentary way as a Voluntative (the so-called Imperfect with paragogic *a*). 6. The proper Imperative of the second person has already been mentioned, the nearness of its relation to the form in *an* and the vowelless form pointed out, and reasons given why it should be regarded, not as a derivative from the latter, but as an independent formation, which has advanced in its own way to a point nearly identical with theirs—nearly, but not quite, for there is a perceptible difference in the coloring of the command as given by the different forms; the Imperative simply states the act (or, more probably, the actor) as an object of thought, and leaves it to be inferred from the tone that it is to be done, and

is thus more peremptory than the others which represent the act as something that is about to be done. There is a similar difference, as is remarkt above, between two imperativ constructions in English, and so also there is a difference in the coloring of two Shemitic expressions for the present, one of which uses the Perfect, and the other the Inchoativ.

Most of the Shemitic dialects now possess only one form for the three unemphatic Inchoativ forms found in Arabic, and this is without final vowel, not answering to the Jezma-form, but representing a merging of the three into one. This form must execute the functions of the original three. But under the stres of this poverty, various languages have created new forms for special purposes, or have devoted to special uses the forms that arose from phonetic usages or from imitation of other languages. Hebrew has made a short Inchoativ by dropping a final consonant, or reducing a vowel, and employs it as a jussiv or optativ, and without the prefix *wa*. Ethiopic, on the other hand, has a lengthend form gotten by inserting a vowel *a* under the first radical, which expresses the incomplete in present, past, and future (answering in general to the Arabic *u*-form), while the older, shortend form is used in the expression of command and wish (somewhat as the Arabic forms in *a* and without final vowel) in dependent and independent sentences; but no very sharp difference between these two is maintaind as in Arabic, the Ethiopic preserving a considerabl freedom in the employment of its forms. The Assyrian Precativ (made by prefixt *lu* or *li*) has a distinct function, and its relation to the original Shemitic scheme is obvious. In Aramaic, particularly in its modern dialects, the old modal expressions hav been largely expunged by the use of the participl. The Amharic shows nearly the same modal development as the Ethiopic, using the old shortened form for command and wish, and the lengthened form in telic sentences, while the Tigriña exhibits a more extensiv employment of the lengthend form in conditional sentences than the Ethiopic, which shows a preference for the Perfect.

It may reasonably be inferd from the examination of the

existing Shemitic languages that the modal material of the primitiv Shemitic was about what we find in classic Arabic. It is certain that the five forms above discust were in the mother-tongue, for they can be traced in all the members of the family. It may be that there were others not now found in Arabic, such as the forms in *umma* and *imma*, of which there are traces in Assyrian, and the simple Inchoativ in *i*, remains of which are found in Arabic. We should in fact not be surprised to find that the seven or eight forms of the Singular noun, together with the Perfect, constituted the original modal material ; but if this were so, the language early dispenst with all but the five, by means of which it was abl to expres its modal ideas with sufficient distinctness. It is certain that the mother-language exprest these distinctions, since the identity of modal development in the various dialects could not be otherwise accounted for.

We hav almost no data for tracing the historical genesis of the modal expressions. We are warranted in holding that the verb-forms began as nouns and noun-verbs, and that the modal development proper began at a time when the cases of the nouns were already in existence. The mode-expression, however, started from the completional difference of the two main forms (one with and the other without preformativ), the only mode-difference that has held its place in the Shemitic languages. The Perfect naturally connected itself with the idea of the real ; the Inchoativ, with that of the unreal. Beyond this point it is not certain how far the mother-language advanced. If we could suppose that the original state of development has been preservd in Arabic, we should hav to say that the primitiv Shemitic had so differentiated the forms that the *a*-form was devoted to the expression of the relation of dependence, the vowelless form to command, wish, and the most delicate shade of the inchoativ conception, and the long form in *na* or *ma* to emphatic assertion, command, or wish, while the more general expression of the unreal was assigned to the *u*-form, and the real, with connected optativ and conditional uses, to the Perfect. On general grounds this may be considerd probabl, but the absence of the modal

a-form in the other dialects leads us to leave the question undecided—it is possible (as is suggested above) that this form is a special creation of Arabic.

We have treated the Perfect as a proper modal form, tho it is usually said in the grammars that the modal development attaches itself only to the Inchoativ. This is perhaps nothing but an affair of phraseology, but the Perfect has a function as truly modal as the other. The Shemitic did not originate special agglutinations for its modes. It took its derived noun-verb (made by a preformativ *ya* from the simple stem) and used its cases for the expression of modal ideas; these cases in all probability at an earlier stage played the part of mere nouns, and, as they advanced to the verb-state, gradually and naturally transformed their case-relations into mode-relations. Similarly, the Perfect, which was also a noun (with pronouns attached) without diversity of case-relations, transferred its nominal conception of completedness and transformed it into the corresponding mode-relations. It seems to work as real a confusion of ideas to confine the name Mode to the Inchoativ, while the Perfect is called an Optativ and a Conditional, as it was, according to the old nomenclature, to call the two main forms Preterit and Future, explaining that the first was also a Present and Future and the second a Preterit and Present. The Shemitic mode-development went out from Shemitic conceptions, and our terminology must be made to conform to these conceptions, not only for the sake of grammatical exactness, but also that we may learn to comprehend the true shades of meaning expressed in the literature of the language.

From what has already been said it is clear that the general tendency in the Shemitic languages has been to drop formal mode-distinctions, and indeed to a compression of all the senses flowing from the Inchoativ into the shortest or Jezma-form (leaving, however, the Imperativ unaffected). In the other direction a compensating process of modal formation has also been going on, but to a less extent.

Ancient Arabic retained or developed the fullest modal material, whether precisely the complete primitive material,

cannot be certainly said. In the earliest remains of Hebrew, reaching back perhaps 1200 or 1300 years B. C., only the Jezma-form is in ful use, the *u* and *a*-forms being preservd only in connection with suffixes, and the *am* (or *an*) form in a petrified state as a Voluntativ (similarly the noun-forms in *u*, *i*, and *a* exist in classical Hebrew only in a petrified state, and with suffixes, the Jezma-form being the common one). The further shortening of this form into the so-called Jussiv is another illustration of the tendency to abridgment, and helps us to understand the prehistoric decadence of the Inchoativ. Of course Hebrew, tho it dropt the forms, retained the ideas, economically reducing the material of expression to what it considerd the minimum, tho afterwards obliged to create a new form suited to its peculiar needs. There is a further step in post-biblical Hebrew, where the main forms have largely sunk the original completional in the derived temporal sense, and the flexibility of the modal expression has suffered corresponding diminution, the Perfect being appropriated to all real and the Inchoativ to all unreal conceptions.

The Assyrian in its earliest known stage shows apparently less formal degradation than the Hebrew in the Inchoativ, inasmuch as it retains the forms in *u* and *a* as wel as the Jézma-form. But it seems to hav quite lost the sense-distinction of these forms. It has also maintained the *ma*-form (and indeed more fully than the Arabic in the three cases *umma*, *amma*, *imma*), but its ordinary Inchoativ is the Jezma-form as in Hebrew. Its new formation of a Precativ has already been mentioned. The curious question, whether it had a Perfect in historical times, must be considered as yet undecided. It certainly brought this form from the mother-tongue, and if its remains do not show it, we may conclude that the Perfect was dropt either from unknown syntactical considerations peculiar to the Assyrian, or through the influence of another language. As its optativ expression is assigned to a peculiar form (the Precativ), it has practically, as far as is now known, comprest its modal material into the Jezma-form.

Pure Aramaic does not appear as a literary language til after the begining of our era, and then shows the same general state of form-degradation as Hebrew and Assyrian, without having developed, like Hebrew, a shorter Inchoativ, or, like Assyrian, a Precativ. There is, indeed, in biblical Aramaic a precativ and future form made by prefix *l*, but there is no trace of it in classic Aramaic and it is probably a peculiar Jewish form, either a dialectic modification of the Aramaic Inchoativ (with preformativ *n*) or a combination of the preposition *l* with the verb. Aramaic has, however, compensated for the loss of the original verb-forms by the use of periphrastic (participial and other) expressions, and in general by advancing towards an analytical structure.

The process of abridgment has been carried by the Ethiopic (whose earliest written remains belong to the fourth century of our era) even farther than by the Hebrew and the Assyrian, but its new lengthend form describd above has brought it back nearer to the original Shemitic modal development. In the other members of the African branch there is no new modal material, except that the Amharic shows, like the Aramaic, a disposition to adopt compound periphrastic forms, and an analytical structure.

Modern Arabic shows about the same stage of formal degradation as ancient Hebrew, and its modal expression has been modified accordingly, and the modern Aramaic dialects exhibit an exaggeration of the tendencies of the classic language.

It appears, therefore, that the loss of primitiv forms and the origination of new forms took place in many of the Shemitic dialects before the historical period; when they appear as written speech, they hav already traversed a long course of growth, decline, and new growth. The primitiv tongue of the family developd a respectabl set of mode-forms out of very simpl material, and the dialects hav curtailed these til there has been left the smallest possibl subjectiv element in the formal verbal expression. A minute examination of the modal expression in any one of the dialects, as Hebrew (which does not belong to the design of this

paper), would nevertheless show a considerable power in the expression of delicate subjective shades of thought, not by distinct forms, but by the suggestions arising from the main completional element of the verb. This element itself may be considered a peculiar Shemitic modal conception, or at least developed in Shemitic speech to an extraordinary degree, and permitting very delicate distinctions of thought. By it the language is enabled to characterize an action as finished, or as just entering on existence and in all the stages of incompleteness. It has seized on and formally fixed the period of "becoming," the stage of advance from non-existence to existence, and has thus given a peculiar dramatic coloring to its ordinary style, while it has grouped around this idea the various conceptions of the ideal that constitute the material of modal thought in our family of languages. These last it has in common with other tongues; but the fundamental conception of completional distinction may be regarded as the Shemitic contribution to the modal material of speech—a conception that it has worked out more fully than any other linguistic family.

II.—*On the Nature of Caesura.*

By M. W. HUMPHREYS,

PROFESSOR OF GREEK IN VANDERBILT UNIVERSITY.

While this paper presents an independent discussion of the nature of caesura, it is so shaped that it also serves as an introduction to the following paper *On the Effects of Elision*.

1. Caesura in general serves two purposes. (a) One of these is to allow the reciter in long verses to catch his breath, in such a way, however, that he shall not be permitted to pause too long for the purpose; and accordingly, in such verses, we usually find a pause at the proper place, or at least the liberty of making a pause without impairing the sense. In the latter case occurs a slight χρόνος κενός or *tempus inane*, which may fall even between words closely connected. This